

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 1

July 3, 2018

341 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Fiano v. Old Saybrook Fire Co. No. 1, Inc. (Order), 329 C 910	134
Henderson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 329 C 911	135
In re Athena C. (Order), 329 C 911	135
JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v. Healey (Order), 329 C 912.	136
State v. Castillo, 329 C 311.	3
<i>Attempt to commit robbery first degree; attempt to commit robbery second degree; motion to suppress; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that nearly seventeen year old defendant was not in custody for purposes of Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436) when police interrogated him in living room of his apartment; factors to be considered in determining whether suspect is in custody for purposes of Miranda, discussed; claim that court should exercise its supervisory authority over administration of justice and adopt per se rule requiring that juvenile waiver forms include language that waiver may apply in adult criminal proceedings if case is transferred from juvenile docket.</i>	
State v. Dijmarescu (Order), 329 C 912.	136
State v. Grajales (Order), 329 C 910	134
State v. Parnoff, 329 C 386	78
<i>Disorderly conduct; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court incorrectly concluded that evidence was insufficient to sustain defendant's conviction; whether defendant's statement that he would get gun and shoot two water company employees unless they left his property constituted fighting words that are unprotected by first amendment to federal constitution; claim that defendant's comment would cause reasonable addressee in position of water company employees to respond with imminent violence; whether subjective analysis of reaction of water company employees supported this court's independent conclusion that average water company employee would not react immediately and violently to defendant's statements.</i>	
Williams v. New Haven, 329 C 366	58
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly upheld decision of workers' compensation commissioner denying defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiff employee's statutory (§ 31-290a) claim of retaliatory discharge; whether plaintiff's claim was precluded by collateral estoppel because it had been decided in prior arbitration under collective bargaining agreement; claim that Genovese v. Gallo Wine Merchants, Inc. (226 Conn. 475), which interpreted statute (§ 31-51bb) providing that no employee shall be denied right to pursue, in court of competent jurisdiction, cause of action arising under state statute solely because employee is covered by collective bargaining agreement, did not apply because plaintiff's claim was filed in forum other than Superior Court; whether phrase in § 31-51bb that employee can pursue claim in court of competent jurisdiction plainly and unambiguously manifested intent to apply exclusively to claims pursued in Superior Court; claim that § 31-51bb had been satisfied because plaintiff filed application to vacate prior arbitration award in Superior Court.</i>	
Volume 329 Cumulative Table of Cases	137

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

HSBC Bank USA, N.A. v. Hallums, 183 CA 175	95A
<i>Foreclosure; strict foreclosure; claim that trial court improperly rendered judgment when plaintiff bank lacked standing; claim that trial court lacked jurisdiction after</i>	

(continued on next page)

defendant's debt was discharged in bankruptcy; claim that trial court improperly refused to apply best evidence rule and clean hands doctrine; whether trial court's findings were supported by record evidence; whether defendant submitted proof that someone else was owner of note and mortgage; whether in rem liability of mortgages survive discharge in bankruptcy; whether creditor's right to foreclose mortgage passes through bankruptcy proceedings; claim that debt and note became unsecured when defendant unilaterally described obligation as unsecured in bankruptcy filings despite valid mortgage lien.

Jenzack Partners, LLC v. Stoneridge Associates, LLC, 183 CA 128 48A

Foreclosure; standing; alleged breach of personal guarantee secured by mortgage on unrelated real property arising out of construction loan agreement; claim that plaintiff lacked standing to foreclose on mortgage on real property because individual defendant's limited guarantee was not specifically assigned from original lender to plaintiff; whether assignment of note operated as assignment of any secondary obligations attached to it; whether circumstances surrounding execution of assignment evidenced intent to assign limited guarantee; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff had established amount of debt due on note; whether testimony concerning starting balance used in computation of debt in exhibit was inadmissible hearsay where witness had no personal knowledge concerning starting balance; whether starting balance used in computation of debt was admissible under business records exception to rule against hearsay pursuant to statute (§ 52-180) when there was no evidence in record regarding lender's business records or its duty to report accurate starting balance to plaintiff and starting balance received by plaintiff, rather than made, in ordinary course of business; whether erroneous admission of evidence was harmful when it directly implicated amount owed under note; claim that trial court, in support of claim for attorney's fees, improperly admitted certain documents that listed nonparty as party entitled to fees.

Magsig v. Magsig, 183 CA 182 102A

Dissolution of marriage; postjudgment motion for contempt; claim that defendant wilfully and intentionally breached parties' separation agreement to hold plaintiff harmless for certain debt by intentionally defaulting on loan, which caused plaintiff to suffer losses; whether trial court properly concluded that agreement did not require plaintiff to be indemnified for any collateral damages that may be caused directly or indirectly by the nonpayment of debt; claim that trial court improperly considered evidence outside of four corners of agreement in determining parties' intent with respect to indemnification language; whether defendant's testimony regarding his understanding of what triggered obligation to indemnify plaintiff was properly admitted for purpose of determining whether defendant had wilfully violated agreement; claim that because indemnification language used in agreement indemnified against liability, plaintiff was not required to wait until she sustained actual loss to bring successful motion for contempt; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant's indemnity obligation was not triggered until bank took affirmative steps to collect from plaintiff with respect to debt.

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

Mikucka v. St. Lucian's Residence, Inc., 183 CA 147	67A
<i>Workers' compensation; appeal from decision of Compensation Review Board affirming decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner; claim that commissioner violated plaintiff's right to due process by not permitting plaintiff to present evidence at formal hearing in support of claim pursuant to Osterlund v. State (135 Conn. 498); whether commissioner's decision prejudicially affected plaintiff's substantive rights; whether commissioner's decision to bifurcate plaintiff's Osterlund claim protected defendants' due process rights; reviewability of claim that commissioner erred in determining that plaintiff was not totally disabled pursuant to Osterlund.</i>	
State v. Baldwin, 183 CA 167	87A
<i>Risk of injury to child; violation of probation; claim that trial court's denial of motion to modify conditions of probation violated defendant's fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination in future proceedings; whether defendant waived claim by entering Alford plea and expressly agreeing, on record, to participate in sex offender treatment, including admitting to conduct that resulted in Alford plea; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to modify and not allowing defendant to delay participating in sex offender treatment until after conclusion of pending habeas matter.</i>	
State v. Gerald A., 183 CA 82	2A
<i>Sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; whether evidence was sufficient to support conviction of sexual assault in first degree; claim that state failed to prove that defendant engaged in sexual intercourse with victim within meaning of applicable statute (§ 53a-65 [2]); whether trial court abused its discretion when it admitted certain uncharged misconduct testimony pertaining to defendant's alleged prior physical violence toward victim and her family; whether probative value of uncharged misconduct evidence was outweighed by its prejudicial effect; whether trial court properly permitted two cases against defendant to be tried jointly; whether evidence in each case would have been cross admissible as prior misconduct in other case; claim that defendant's conduct in each case was not similar; claim that prejudicial effect of evidence outweighed its probative value; whether trial court abused its discretion when it denied defendant's motion to make opening statement to jury; whether trial court's ruling was harmful.</i>	
State v. Morris, 183 CA 181	101A
<i>Writ of error; unpreserved claim that trial court violated right to due process of plaintiff in error during adjudication of bond forfeiture proceedings; whether trial court properly denied motion for release from surety obligations of plaintiff in error.</i>	
Volume 183 Cumulative Table of Cases	121A

CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK

Revisions to the Practice Book, Rules of Professional Conduct, Code of Judicial Conduct, and Superior Court Rules	1PB
---	-----

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries	1B
---------------------	----

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

State Elections Enforcement Commission	1C
--	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel	1D
---	----